

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/014,277	12/11/2001	Gunnar Hedin	980.1124US01	3024
38846	7590 05/12/2004		EXAMINER	
CARLSON, CASPERS, VANDENBURGH & LINDQUIST			VY, HUNG T	
225 SO. 6TH SUITE 3200			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MPIS, MN	55402		2828	
			DATE MAILED: 05/12/200-	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	10/014,277	HEDIN ET AL.	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hung T Vy	2828	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addre	ss
THE REPLY FILED 03 May 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to averally final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to places the application	to a on in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date			<i></i>
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THe date on which the petition under 37 CFI fextension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection IE FINAL REJECTION. S R 1.136(a) and the approp unt of the fee. The approp originally set in the final Of	ee MPEP riate extension priate extension ffice action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF			
2. \square The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simp	olifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.	
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed ar	nendment
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: <u>See</u>		dered but does NOT	place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were i	newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			d an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: 1-52.			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	oved or b) disapproved by the	he Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). <u>1</u>	<u>, 3 and 5</u> .	~ /
10. Other:		Allson	Lu
		Wilson Lee	
	F	Primary Examin	er
	•	minuty with	

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's argument filed on 05/03/2004 is not persuasive because this is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented. Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b). The second applicant's argument that Kanehira fails to teach a fringe-producing element. Applicant's argument is not persuasive because the claim recites only fringe-producing optical element. It makes nothing different elements (5) and (43) in Kanehira's reference. Further, on reciting reference in the office action mailing on 3/10/2004, Examiner notes that Chang-Hasnain et al. (U.S. 6,233,263) also show a fringe-producing optical element (20)(See fig. 1-7). Therefore, the claims are not patenable distinct over the Kanechira patent.